

## Message Text

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 01 GENEVA 00310 191236Z

45

ACTION EUR-25

INFO OCT-01 IO-14 ISO-00 CIAE-00 PM-07 H-03 INR-10 L-03

NSAE-00 NSC-10 PA-04 RSC-01 PRS-01 SPC-03 SS-20

USIA-15 NEA-10 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 EB-11 OMB-01 ACDA-19

AEC-11 CU-04 STR-08 DRC-01 /183 W  
----- 025632

P 191150Z JAN 74

FM USMISSION GENEVA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 3449

INFO ALL CSCE CAPITALS PRIORITY 78

USNMR SHAPE

USLOSACLANT

USDOCOSOUTH

C O N F I D E N T I A L GENEVA 0310

VIENNA ALSO FOR USDEL MBFR

E.O.11652 GDS

TAGS PFOR

SUBJ CSCE: SUBCOMMITTEE ON MILITARY SECURITY  
(CBMS); DISCUSSION OF MOVEMENTS

1. SUMMARY. AT LENGTHY NATO CAUCUSES MANY ALLIES, WITH BRITISH IN FOREFRONT, ARGUED TO CONTINUE, FOR TACTICAL REASONS, BACKING MOVEMENTS, ALTHOUGH THEY CANDIDLY ACKNOWLEDGE HERE THAT IN LIGHT OF SOVIET STANCE THERE IS PRACTICALLY NO PROSPECT THAT MOVEMENTS MEASURE WILL APPEAR IN FINAL DOCUMENT. MOREOVER, PORTUGUESE HAVE VOICED THEIR OPPOSITION TO MOVEMENTS IN CAUCUSES AND ITALIANS HAVE TOLD US PRIVATELY THEY NOW HAVE INSTRUCTIONS NOT TO SPEAK IN FAVOR OF MOVEMENTS. GREEK AND CANADIAN REPS HAVE BOTH SUGGESTED IN CAUCUSES SEPARATING MOVEMENTS AND MANEUVERS, ALTHOUGH CANADIANS STILL WISH TO RETAIN SIMILAR IF WEAKER SUBSTANCE IN SEPARATE MOVEMENT MEASURE. TURKISH REP ALSO EXPRESSED RESERVATIONS ON ASPECTS OF MOVEMENTS.

CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 02 GENEVA 00310 191236Z

END SUMMARY.

2. UK DRAFT RESOLUTION ON CBMS (USNATO 6282) WAS SUBJECT OF LENGTHY DISCUSSIONS DURING PAST WEEK AT TWO CAUCUSES OF NATO REPS ON MILITARY SECURITY SUBCOMMITTEE AND PARTICULAR ATTENTION WAS DEVOTED TO PROBLEM OF DROPPING PRIOR NOTIFICATION OF MAJOR MILITARY MOVEMENTS FROM RESOLUTION AS REQUESTED BY US (STATE 005065). ALL NATO REPS, NOTABLY INCLUDING BRITISH, AGREED THAT QUESTIONFACING ALLIANCE WAS NOT WHETHER MOVEMENTS SHOULD BE DROPPED BUT WHEN AND IN WHAT MANNER. NO ONE EXPECTED THAT SOVIETS WOULD EVER ACCEPT MOVEMENTS AS CBM.

3. DISCUSSIONS BROUGHT TO LIGHT FACT THAT SOME OTHER NATO DELS ALSO HAVE RESERVATIONS ABOUT INCLUDING MOVEMENTS IN CBMS. ITALIAN REP STATED THAT HIS GOVERNMENT HAD SOME PROBLEMS IN DEALING WITH MOVEMENTS AND MANEUVERS AT SAME LEVEL AS IS DONE IN UK DRAFT AND THAT THEY PREFERRED THE WAY IN WHICH FRG HAD HANDLED THIS QUESTION IN PROPOSED GERMAN PAPER RECAPITULATING THEIR VIEWS ON CBMS. (FRG PAPER, AS PRESENTLY DRAFTED, DEALS SEPARATELY WITH MOVEMENTS ISSUE AND PORTRAYS THE INCLUSION OF PRIOR NOTIFICATION OF MOVEMENTS AMONG CBMS AS "ONE" CONCLUSION THAT MIGHT BE REACHED AS RESULT OF SUBCOMMITTEE'S STUDY OF QUESTION. PORTUGUESE REP SAID THAT HIS LATEST INSTRUCTIONS STATED THAT PORTUGAL WOULD HAVE SERIOUS OBJECTION OF GIVING PRIOR NOTIFICATION OF MOVEMENTS OUTSIDE EUROPE. TURKISH REP SAID HIS GOVERNMENT WAS BASICALLY OPPOSED TO DEALING WITH MANEUVERS AND MOVEMENTS IN ONE PACKAGE, AS IS DONE IN UK DRAFT, AND THAT TURKEY WOULD NOT BE ABLE TO AGREE TO GIVE NOTICE OF MOVEMENTS TAKING PLACE IN SOUTHERN TWO-THIRDS OF ITS TERRITORY, WHICH IS NEAR NATIONS NOT PARTICIPATING IN CSCE. CANADIAN REP EXPRESSED VIEW THAT CONTINUED MARRIAGE OF MOVEMENTS AND MANEUVERS, AS IN UK DRAFT, MIGHT DO ALLIANCE MORE HARM THAN GOOD AND THAT PERHAPS MOVEMENTS SHOULD BE HANDLED SEPARATELY IN THE DRAFT, PERHAPS WITH REDUCED LEVEL OF OBLIGATION.

4. FRG REP PRIVATELY AGREED WITH US AS FAR AS FUTURE OF MOVEMENTS ISSUE WAS CONCERNED BUT SAID THAT FRG FELT THAT FOR TACTICAL REASONS MOVEMENTS SHOULD BE INCLUDED IN UK DRAFT WHEN IT WAS TABLED. UK REP PRESSED FOR RETENTION  
CONFIDENTIAL

CONFIDENTIAL

PAGE 03 GENEVA 00310 191236Z

OF MOVEMENTS AND WAS SUPPORTED BY DANES, FRENCH AND NORWEGIANS IN ADDITION TO FRG. US REPS REITERATED USG POSITION, PRESSING ARGUMENTS USED AT JANUARY 10-11 NATO MEETING IN BRUSSELS ON THIS SUBJECT (USNATO 0155). AT ONE POINT, UK REP ASKED WHETHER US MIGHT BE ABLE TO ACCEPT TREATMENT OF MOVEMENTS SUGGESTED IN BRACKETED PORTION OF NORWEGIAN AMENDMENT (GENEVA 270) TO UK DRAFT, I.E., CITE NOTIFICATION OF MOVEMENTS AS MEASURE WHICH

MIGHT BE ADDED IN FUTURE TO ENLARGE AND STRENGTHEN OTHER CBMS. NORWEGIAN REP, HOWEVER, INTERVENED TO SAY THAT WHILE MOVEMENTS MIGHT ULTIMATELY BE HANDLED IN THAT WAY AS END-RESULT OF CONFERENCE, NORWAY FELT MOVEMENTS MUST BE RETAINED IN UK DRAFT FOR PRESENT AND THAT REFERENCE TO MOVEMENTS IN NORWEGIAN AMENDMENT SHOULD BE DELETED.

5. UK REP EXPRESSED HOPE THAT IF BRITISH WENT AHEAD AND TABLED THEIR DRAFT RESOLUTION WITH MOVEMENTS STILL INCLUDED, US DEL WOULD NOT REGISTER ITS DISAPPROVAL OF DRAFT AT SUBCOMMITTEE OR REMAIN COMPLETELY SILENT ABOUT IT. US REPS REPLIED THAT THEIR LATEST INSTRUCTIONS DID NOT COVER THAT EVENTUALITY AND THAT USG NATURALLY COULD NOT TAKE A POSITION ON THE DRAFT RESOLUTION UNTIL IT WAS CLEAR HOW ADDITIONAL ISSUES THAT US AND OTHER DELS HAD RAISED WERE RESOLVED. US REPS NOTED, HOWEVER, THAT WE HAD ALREADY INDICATED AT NATO THAT US WOULD BE ABLE TO SUPPORT ALLIES ON A NUMBER OF SPECIFIC POSITIONS VCOVERING MANEUVERS AND US REPS EXPRESSED VIEW THAT USDEL WOULD PROBABLY BE IN POSITION TO SUPPORT THOSE ELEMENTS OF UK DRAFT THT CORRESPOND TO THOSE POSITIONS. US REPS WARNED, HOWEVER, THAT US DEL MUST NOT BE EXPECTED TO PRETEND THAT USG COULD ACCEPT PRIOR NOTIFICATION OF MOVEMENTS AND THAT THE UK'S CONTINUED PRESSING OF MOVEMENTS ISSUE AT SUBCOMMITTEE GREATLY INCREASED THE RISK THAT THIS DIFFERENCE WITHIN THE ALLIANCE WOULD BECOME SPOTLIGHTED.BASSIN

CONFIDENTIAL

NNN

## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptioning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 01 JAN 1994  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** SECURITY, ARMS  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Draft Date:** 19 JAN 1974  
**Decaption Date:** 01 JAN 1960  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Authority:** garlanwa  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 28 MAY 2004  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1974GENEVA00310  
**Document Source:** CORE  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** GS  
**Errors:** N/A  
**Film Number:** n/a  
**From:** GENEVA  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1974/newtext/t19740130/aaaabbua.tel  
**Line Count:** 141  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE  
**Office:** ACTION EUR  
**Original Classification:** CONFIDENTIAL  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 3  
**Previous Channel Indicators:**  
**Previous Classification:** CONFIDENTIAL  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** n/a  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Authority:** garlanwa  
**Review Comment:** n/a  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 21 MAR 2002  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review History:** RELEASED <21 MAR 2002 by worrelsw>; APPROVED <11 APR 2002 by garlanwa>  
**Review Markings:**

Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
30 JUN 2005

**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Referrals:** n/a  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** CSCE: SUBCOMMITTEE ON MILITARY SECURITY (CBMS); DISCUSSION OF MOVEMENTS  
**TAGS:** PFOR, CSCE  
**To:** STATE  
**Type:** TE  
**Markings:** Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005